

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include new Figure sheets 1 and 2 which remove the foreign filing numerals to which the Examiner has objected.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 11, 14, and 15 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and to include all limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 9-13, and 16-26 will be pending in this application. Applicants have amended claim 9 to address the Examiner's § 112 rejections and to incorporate claim 11, such that claim 11 is effectively rewritten in independent form. Applicants have canceled claim 14 and added new claim 17, which combines claims 9 and 14, such that claim 14 is effectively rewritten in independent form. Applicants have canceled claim 15 and added new claim 21, which combines claims 9 and 15, such that claim 15 is effectively rewritten in independent form.

New claims 18-20 correspond to claims 12, 13, and 16, but for new claim 17. New claims 22-26 correspond to claims 10-13 and 16, but for new claim 21.

No new matter has been added. Based on the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

II. Oath

The Examiner has objected to the oath as defective. Applicants submit a corrected oath with this response.

III. Drawings

The drawings are objected to because they include the foreign filing numerals thereon. Appropriate correction has been made and replacement sheets are submitted herewith.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claims 9-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner states that in claim 9, “two doors having each closure means” lacks antecedent basis. The Examiner has also objected to the use of “said goggles” in numerous claims. The Examiner has further objected to the phrase “corresponding to a bilateral plane of symmetry of said goggles” in claim 9 as being indefinite, as well as other technical issues in claim 9 and claims 12-14. Appropriate correction has been made to these claims, and all issues raised are believed to be addressed.

V. 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected certain claims, but based upon the rewritten claims discussed above, these rejections are believed to be moot.

CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims and issuance of a patent containing these claims in due course. If the Examiner believes there are any issues that can be resolved via a telephone conference, or there are any informalities that can be corrected by an Examiner's amendment, he is invited to please call Kristin Crall at 404.815.6147.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kristin M. Crall 46,895/

Kristin M. Crall
Reg. No. 46,895

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia, 30309-4530
404.815.6147